

07HY

Site:	Citizen Last Choice
ID #:	JAD984589093
Break:	22.6 APCS
Other:	82-7PH4
	A/D

asp

MEMORANDUM

Date:

TO: Marie Noel
Contracting Officer

THRU: Nancy Healy
Project Officer

FROM: Betty Berry
WAM/MPM

SUBJECT: Technical Review, Work Plan No. HA # 82 original

This report is a comprehensive review and evaluation of the contractor's proposed workplan and cost estimate. If you require amplification of any data elements, you are invited to contact Betty Berry. We are available to participate in fact-finding sessions as well as in the negotiation of this work assignment. We would appreciate receiving a copy of the negotiation memorandum and any comments you have which would improve the value of future reports.

In accordance with your request, a technical evaluation has been performed on the subject workplan.

We have evaluated the technical approach of the contractor's proposed workplan and of the proposed labor skills, labor hours, travel, subcontract, material type and quantities, and other direct cost. Details of this review are provided in Part I & II attached. Below is a summary of our review:

Summary of review:

	LOE	Total Cost Including Fee
Total Proposed Amount <u>WAM/MPM</u> <u>IGCE</u>	1,126	\$ 82,633
Total Recommended Amount <u>Jacobson</u>	906	\$ 54,087
Difference	(220)	(28,546)

Attachments:

Part I

Part II



40016054
SUPERFUND RECORDS

PART I

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL REVIEW

1. Does the Contractor address all tasks in the SOW?

☒ YES ☐ NO

(If no. explain)

2. Does the Contractor include work not required by the SOW?

☐ YES ☒ NO

(If yes, explain and indicate whether you agree that the additional work is needed to accomplish objective)

3. Does Contractor include a task for work plan development?

☒ YES ☐ NO

(If no. explain)

4. Does Contractor include a task for project management?

☒ YES ☐ NO

(If no. explain)

5. Does Contractor include a task for work assignment closeout?

☒ YES ☐ NO

(If no. explain)

6. Is the schedule, including interim milestones, acceptable?

☒ YES ☐ NO

(If no. explain and indicate an acceptable schedule)

7. Will the contractor be required to acquire property for this work assignment?

☐ YES ☒ NO

8. Will Government furnished property be required?

☐ YES ☒ NO

9. Has adequate time been allowed for property acquisition?

☐ YES ☐ NO N/A

(If no, explain and indicate an acceptable schedule)

10. Are safety and contingency measures needed for performance of this work assignment?

☒ YES ☐ NO

11. If yes, please indicate where in the work plan safety is addressed. Describe needed changes or deficiencies if applicable.

Site specific health + safety is addressed under the
category: Oversight of field Activities.

12. Does this work assignment require mixed funding?

☐ YES ☒ NO

13. If yes, has the contractor established in the workplan procedures for segregating and reporting cost in accordance with mixed funding requirements?

☐ YES ☐ NO N/A

14. Does the subcontracting effort proposed by the contractor include hiring of consultant? (If yes, please explain the type of service to be provided by the consultants.)

☐ YES ☒ NO

PART II TECHNICAL REVIEW

TASK NO. 1				DESCRIPTION: Project Planning / Closeout			
LOE COMPARISON				COST COMPARISON			
	IGCE	WP	DIFF		IGCE	WP	DIFF
P4	40	58	18	TRAVEL COSTS	\$22	\$110	\$88
P3	71	0	11	OTHER DIRECT COSTS	\$3450	\$5799	\$2349
P2	80	32	52	EQUIPMENT COSTS	0	0	0
P1	20	123	103	SUBCONTRACT COSTS	0	0	0
T2	0	0	0				
T1	0	0	0				
	211	213	2	TOTAL			

WAM Review. Comments and Recommendations:

IGCE total LOE equals 211 vs contractor's 213 hours. IGCE assumed a higher P-level. Per my discussion w/PO, LOE is reasonable but would like to see P-4 hours reduced to the IGCE level of 40 hours.
 $(10 \text{ mos. c. 1}) + \text{wp prep} + \text{monthly load} \approx 40$
 A lower skill mix proposed is reasonable. IGCE difference due to PC time. Contractor's 22 mos. (Main frame) should be 10 mos. (02/94-12/94). Travel reasonable

Project Officer Comments and Recommendations:

PO concurs w/ WAM

Negot:

1. P-4 hrs to 40
2. Reduce mainframe to 10 months.

PART II TECHNICAL REVIEW

TASK NO. 2				DESCRIPTION: Oversight of Field Activities			
LOE COMPARISON				COST COMPARISON			
	IGCE	WP	DIFF		IGCE	WP	DIFF
P4	10	6	4	TRAVEL COSTS	\$5,465	1,929	
P3	270	0	270	OTHER DIRECT COSTS	200	1,150	
P2	225	12	213	EQUIPMENT COSTS	0	0	
P1	0	377	377	SUBCONTRACT COSTS	0	0	
T2							
T1							
505 395 110				TOTAL			

WAM Review. Comments and Recommendations: My estimate assumed that the previous site mgr. would be assigned to the site and I assumed that he was a higher P-level. My experience w/ the site mgr. assigned to the site is that he is competent to manage the project at the P1 level. I agree that the 395 hours proposed in the WP are adequate to do the job. Please question the number of clerical hours. ODCs were omitted from IGCE. The \$1,150 for shipment & log book are reasonable as researched w/ more experienced RPMs. WP travel only assumed 1 person; IGCE assumed 2 persons would be on site. I recommend 2 people. Contractor did not estim. mileage or rental vehicle. Please question.

Project Officer Comments and Recommendations:

Concur w/ WAM.

PART II TECHNICAL REVIEW

TASK NO. <u>3</u>				DESCRIPTION: <u>Review of Submittals</u>			
LOE COMPARISON				COST COMPARISON			
	IGCE	WP	DIFF		IGCE	WP	DIFF
P4	10	8	2	TRAVEL COSTS	0	0	0
P3	50	0	50	OTHER DIRECT COSTS			
P2	10	20	10	EQUIPMENT COSTS			
P1	10	60	50	SUBCONTRACT COSTS			
T2							
T1							
	80	88	8	TOTAL	0	0	0

WAM Review. Comments and Recommendations:

Hours are commensurate between the IGCE and workplan, but the skill mix is different. Again, I assumed that the site manager was at a higher P-level than he actually was. Their proposed number of hours is reasonable.

Project Officer Comments and Recommendations:

PO recommends approval

PART II TECHNICAL REVIEW

TASK NO. <u>4</u>				DESCRIPTION: <u>Technical Asst. to RPN</u>			
LOE COMPARISON				COST COMPARISON			
	IGCE	WP	DIFF		IGCE	WP	DIFF
P4	25	8	17	TRAVEL COSTS	0	466 500	
P3	35	0	35	OTHER DIRECT COSTS	0	42	
P2	220	65		EQUIPMENT COSTS			
P1	25	120		SUBCONTRACT COSTS			
T2							
T1							
<u>305</u> <u>193</u>				TOTAL			

WAM Review, Comments and Recommendations:

Under Task 4, WAF revision #1, Target Survey information was added as a part of technical assistance. I researched the hours that were needed for this task with Carole Long, NPR coordinator, and Pete Culver, SA coordinator. They both stated that the contractor would need 220 hours to do a full scale target survey. I would like the hours in the IGCE approved and have the contractor revise their proposed hours. Again, I assumed a higher P-level than was assigned. Recommend negotiating to IGCE hours and contractor's skill mix. Please ask contractor to omit express mail - \$42. Delete trip estimated w/RR since scoping meeting, my assumptions have changed.


Project Officer Comments and Recommendations:

PO concurs w/ WAM's review

PART II TECHNICAL REVIEW

TASK NO. 5				DESCRIPTION: Community Relations			
LOE COMPARISON				COST COMPARISON			
	IGCE	WP	DIFF		IGCE	WP	DIFF
P4	0	2	2	TRAVEL COSTS	0	0	
P3	10	0	10	OTHER DIRECT COSTS	0	0	
P2	0	5	5	EQUIPMENT COSTS			
P1	10	10	0	SUBCONTRACT COSTS			
T2							
T1							
	20	17	3	TOTAL			

WAM Review. Comments and Recommendations: *Minimal differences - reasonable. Recommend approval.*

PO comments


Project Officer Comments and Recommendations: